UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA EASTERN DIVISION

99 JUL 12 PM 4: 23
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
N.D. OF ALABAMA

LARR	Y PROTHRO,)		
	Plaintiff,	,		
	vs.)	CV 98-PT-2843-E	1 10.0
СТТУ	OF HEFLIN, ALABAMA,)		Mars
al,	or ner arn, nameran,)		1
	Defendants.))		ENTERED
)		
				JUL 1 2 1999

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This cause comes on to be heard on the Motion For Summary Judgment filed by defendants on May 24, 1999.

Plaintiff makes two claims: (1) Denial of due process; and (2) race discrimination. The plaintiff was a probationary employee and did not have a protected property interest. The fact that he was a re-hire did not change this status. The motion will be granted as to the due process claim(s). 1

The evidence as to race discrimination may hang on the thin reed of disparate treatment as related to Jones. Sometimes thin reeds have to go to trial, at least for further court review, if not jury review. Much of the so-called comparator evidence may not

¹The law is certainly not clearly established in this area. At least, Lambert is entitled to qualified immunity.



Case 1:98-cv-02843-RBP Document 34 Filed 07/12/99 Page 2 of 2

be admissible. That can be addressed by motion(s) in limine.

The motion will be granted as to the due process $\operatorname{claim}(s)$ and denied as to the race discrimination claim .

This day of July, 1999,

ROBERT B. PROPST

SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE